6

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,648	11/29/2001	Mark A. Kirkpatrick	BS01-299	3215

38516 7590 04/02/2007
SCOTT P. ZIMMERMAN, PLLC
PO BOX 3822
CARY, NC 27519

EXAMINER	
ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2131	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/995,648	KIRKPATRICK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kaveh Abrishamkar	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 January 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on January 12, 2007. Claims 1-30 remain pending in the application.

2. Independent claims 1, 12, 22, and 23 are currently amended.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed January 12, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Regarding the independent claims, the Applicant argues that the Cited Prior Art (CPA), Sitaraman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,718,332) in view of Hitchcock et al. (U.S. Patent 6,460,042), do not teach the newly added limitation which recites validation rules that "change the data to be validated to ASCII character strings, the validation rules also changing a validation function from an IsBetween method to an IsMember method." This argument is not found persuasive. The Examiner asserts that this newly added limitations is indefinite as it is unclear what "IsBetween" and "IsMember" methods comprise. It appears that these are Java built-in functions, but for the purposes of the claim language, the functionality or the purpose of using these methods should be defined to render the claim definite and unambiguous. Furthermore, without defining the function of these two methods, it is interpreted that any function which performs validation on data can be used to reject the claims, and the CPA contains data

validation functions, and functions which convert data into different strings (Sitaraman: column 10 lines 26-32), and furthermore, compares validation rules to the data (Sitaraman: column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator of Sitaraman checks different attributes and attribute names. It would have been obvious to convert these attributes to ASCII strings for comparing, since it was well-known in the art that ASCII codes represent text in computers. Therefore, it is asserted that the CPA teaches the newly added limitations and therefore, the references are applied as given below in the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner asserts that the newly added limitation of "changing the data to be validated to ASCII character strings, the validation rules also changing a validation function from an IsBetween method to an IsMember method" is indefinite as it is unclear what "IsBetween" and "IsMember" methods comprise. It appears that these are Java built-in functions, but for the purposes of the claim language, the functionality or the purpose of using these methods should be defined to render the claim definite and unambiguous. The presently stated claim language leaves open the functions performing a number of different functions, as the functions are not clearly defined in the claim language. Furthermore, without defining the function of

these two methods, it is interpreted that any function, which performs validation on data, can be used to reject the claims for the purposes of examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-7, 10-18, and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,718,332) in view of Hitchcock et al. (U.S. Patent 6,460,042).

Regarding claim 1, Sitaraman discloses:

A client-server computer system for use with web-based applications comprising:

a computer system running one or more web browsers capable of processing web forms (Figure 1 item 30, column 2 lines 33-41);

a web server capable of processing Java code and web-based forms (column 2 lines 33-41);

a storage mechanism coupled to said computer system, wherein said web server is used for validating data with information compiled from said storage mechanism (column 4 lines 33-38), wherein a database is used to store user data which is then validated at the source data adapter;

validation rules stored in said storage mechanism , the validation rules comprising at least three views, with each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location;

comparing the data to be validated to the validation rules (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator compares the attributes to values held in the dictionary name location.

wherein each execution sequence designates an order of execution for the validation methods (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location;

wherein each validation method compares validation values to the data (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location, wherein each of the steps compares the data to a stored value stored in the dictionary name location.

Sitaraman does not explicitly teach that the views are "hierarchically organized." Sitaraman teaches different multiple views, wherein the attribute name location, attribute value location, and attribute definition, are interpreted as three different views. However, Sitaraman does not explicitly disclose that these are "hierarchically

organized." Hitchcock discloses a system wherein web forms are put through different stages (hierarchy) of validation methods (column 6 lines 26-37). Hitchcock discloses at different stages of validation methods, wherein the first stage checks the posted data by the applicant, and if an error occurs, a correction page is sent to the applicant (column 6 lines 13-25) and the second stage validation checks the data form again to make sure the information provided meets the criteria of the specific destination before the information is supplied to the destination database. This hierarchy is necessary in the system of Hitchcock so that information can be customized for different institutions (column 7 lines 2-13). Sitaraman and Hitchcock are analogous arts because both are directed to data validation of web forms. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a "hierarchically organized" views in Sitaraman's system of validating user records so that the data could be customized for different destinations of the user records and that that customized data is validated before being stored at a destination.

Furthermore, Sitaraman and Hitchcock do not explicitly teach "changing the data to be validated to ASCII character strings, the validation rules also changing a validation function from an IsBetween method to an IsMember method." The CPA contains data validation functions, and functions which convert data into different strings (Sitaraman: column 10 lines 26-32), and furthermore, compares validation rules to the data (Sitaraman: column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator of Sitaraman checks different attributes and attribute names. It would have

been obvious to convert these attributes to ASCII strings for comparing, since it was well-known in the art that ASCII codes represent text in computers.

Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 1, wherein the validation rules change the validation function from a check between two integer values to a check for membership of a set, (column 7 lines 28-40), *wherein the attributes are checked for membership in a set by comparing them to dictionary name location values* and if a value has no validation rules, then a lower priority view's execution sequence is performed (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), *wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location).*

Claim 3 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 1, wherein the validation rules type cast a single value integer (column 7 lines 41-51), wherein the data validator checks that a value type is consistent with the value type stored in the dictionary name location.

Claim 4 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 1, wherein the validation rules type cast an integer as a string (column 7 lines 41-51), wherein the data validator checks that a value type is consistent with the value type stored in the dictionary name location by verifying the string or integer value.

Claim 5 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 1, wherein the validation rules change legacy data to the ASCII character string (column 10 lines 27-31), wherein the target data adapter converts the format of the validated user record into a suitable format and it would have been obvious to convert these attributes to ASCII strings for comparing, since it was well-known in the art that ASCII codes represent text in computers.

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 5, wherein the validation rules change the legacy data to check for membership in a data set of ASCII character strings (column 10 lines 26-27), wherein the data is changed to a proper format, and uses an event, which matches an event type on the target interface.

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 1, wherein the validation rules validate an entire set of data (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63).

Claim 10 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 1, wherein each validation rule includes an associated application tag that differentiates versions of an application (column 2 lines 48-61), wherein there are different types of database definitions.

Claim 11 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 1, wherein each validation rule includes an associated application tag that differentiates instances of an application and version for different users (column 2 lines 48-61), wherein there are different types of database definitions.

Regarding claim 12, Sitaraman discloses:

A web server system comprising:

at least one web application (column 2 lines 33-41);

means for performing validation service on data submitted by said at least one we application (column 2 lines 33-41);

means for processing web forms (column 2 lines 33-41);

means for storing and retrieving validation rules for performing said validation server, the validation rules comprising at three views, with each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location;

wherein each execution sequence designates an order of execution for the validation methods (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location;

wherein each validation method compares validation values to the data (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location, wherein each of the steps compares the data to a stored value stored in the dictionary name location; and

means for compiling validation rules into said at least one web application in order to perform said validation service (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then

the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location.

Sitaraman does not explicitly teach that the views are "hierarchically organized." Sitaraman teaches different multiple views, wherein the attribute name location, attribute value location, and attribute definition, are interpreted as three different views. However, Sitaraman does not explicitly disclose that these are "hierarchically organized." Hitchcock discloses a system wherein web forms are put through different stages (hierarchy) of validation methods (column 6 lines 26-37). Hitchcock discloses at different stages of validation methods, wherein the first stage checks the posted data by the applicant, and if an error occurs, a correction page is sent to the applicant (column 6 lines 13-25) and the second stage validation checks the data form again to make sure the information provided meets the criteria of the specific destination before the information is supplied to the destination database. This hierarchy is necessary in the system of Hitchcock so that information can be customized for different institutions (column 7 lines 2-13). Sitaraman and Hitchcock are analogous arts because both are directed to data validation of web forms. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a "hierarchically organized" views in Sitaraman's system of validating user records so that the data could be customized for different destinations of the user records and that that customized data is validated before being stored at a destination.

Furthermore, Sitaraman and Hitchcock do not explicitly teach "changing the data to be validated to ASCII character strings, the validation rules also changing a validation function from an IsBetween method to an IsMember method." The CPA contains data validation functions, and functions which convert data into different strings (Sitaraman: column 10 lines 26-32), and furthermore, compares validation rules to the data (Sitaraman: column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator of Sitaraman checks different attributes and attribute names. It would have been obvious to convert these attributes to ASCII strings for comparing, since it was well-known in the art that ASCII codes represent text in computers.

Claim 13 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A web server system according to claim 12, wherein if the validation rules change the validation function from a check between two integer values to a check for membership of a set, (column 7 lines 28-40), *wherein the attributes are checked for membership in a set by comparing them to dictionary name location values* and if a view has no validation rules, then a lower priority view's execution sequence is performed (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location).

Claim 14 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A web server system according to claim 12, wherein the validation rules type cast a single integer (column 7 lines 41-51), wherein the data validator checks that a value type is consistent with the value type stored in the dictionary name location.

Claim 15 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A web server system according to claim 12, wherein said validation rules type cast an integer as a string (column 7 lines 41-51), wherein the data validator checks that a value type is consistent with the value type stored in the dictionary name location by verifying the string or integer value.

Claim 16 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A web server system according to claim 12, wherein the validation rules change legacy data to the ASCII character string values (column 10 lines 27-31), wherein the target data adapter converts the format of the validated user record into a suitable format and it would have been obvious to convert these attributes to ASCII strings for comparing, since it was well-known in the art that ASCII codes represent text in computers.

Claim 17 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 16. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A web server system according to claim 16 wherein the validation rules change the legacy data to check for membership in a data set of ASCII character strings (column 10 lines 26-27), wherein the data is changed to a proper format, and uses an event, which matches an event type on the target interface.

Claim 18 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A web server system according to claim 12, wherein validation rules validate an entire set of data (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63).

Claim 21 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A web server system according to claim 12, wherein each validation rule includes an associated application tag that differentiates instances of an application and version for different users (column 2 lines 48-61), wherein there are different types of database definitions.

Regarding claim 22, Sitaraman discloses:

A computer-readable media with instructions executable by a processor for providing a validation application service for web-based applications, the media comprising instructions to:

couple a service request from a data device to a web server, the request including data to be validated (column 2 lines 33-41);

generate a service session instruction, the service session instruction based at least in part on the service request (column 2 lines 33-41);

send the service session instruction to one or more web servers, the service session instruction corresponding to one or more data validation requests from said customer data device (column 1 lines 55-67, column 2 lines 33-41);

compile at least one page based on stored validation rules in a database, the validation rules comprising at least three views, with each view utilizing an execution sequence for the validation methods, and wherein each validation method compares validation values to the data (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location; and

send a validation service response to the data device, wherein the validation service response is based on the service request (column 1 lines 55-67), wherein after the data is validated for the correct form, it is sent to the receiver.

Sitaraman does not explicitly teach that the views are "hierarchically organized." Sitaraman teaches different multiple views, wherein the attribute name location,

attribute value location, and attribute definition, are interpreted as three different views. However, Sitaraman does not explicitly disclose that these are "hierarchically organized." Hitchcock discloses a system wherein web forms are put through different stages (hierarchy) of validation methods (column 6 lines 26-37). Hitchcock discloses at different stages of validation methods, wherein the first stage checks the posted data by the applicant, and if an error occurs, a correction page is sent to the applicant (column 6 lines 13-25) and the second stage validation checks the data form again to make sure the information provided meets the criteria of the specific destination before the information is supplied to the destination database. This hierarchy is necessary in the system of Hitchcock so that information can be customized for different institutions (column 7 lines 2-13). Sitaraman and Hitchcock are analogous arts because both are directed to data validation of web forms. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a "hierarchically organized" views in Sitaraman's system of validating user records so that the data could be customized for different destinations of the user records and that that customized data is validated before being stored at a destination.

Furthermore, Sitaraman and Hitchcock do not explicitly teach "changing the data to be validated to ASCII character strings, the validation rules also changing a validation function from an IsBetween method to an IsMember method." The CPA contains data validation functions, and functions which convert data into different strings (Sitaraman: column 10 lines 26-32), and furthermore, compares validation rules to the data (Sitaraman: column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data

validator of Sitaraman checks different attributes and attribute names. It would have been obvious to convert these attributes to ASCII strings for comparing, since it was well-known in the art that ASCII codes represent text in computers.

Regarding claim 23, Sitaraman discloses:

A method of providing validation data service with a web-based computer system comprising the steps of:

calling at least one page from a web application (column 2 lines 33-41);

compiling said at least one page at a web server (column 2 lines 33-41);;

retrieving validation rules from a centralized storage mass coupled to said web server, the validation rules comprising at least three views, with each view utilizing an execution sequence of validation methods, wherein each execution sequence designates an order of execution for the validation methods, and wherein each validation method compares validation values to the data (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location;

validating data from said web application in accordance with said validation rules service (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location.

Sitaraman does not explicitly teach that the views are "hierarchically organized." Sitaraman teaches different multiple views, wherein the attribute name location, attribute value location, and attribute definition, are interpreted as three different views. However, Sitaraman does not explicitly disclose that these are "hierarchically organized." Hitchcock discloses a system wherein web forms are put through different stages (hierarchy) of validation methods (column 6 lines 26-37). Hitchcock discloses at different stages of validation methods, wherein the first stage checks the posted data by the applicant, and if an error occurs, a correction page is sent to the applicant (column 6 lines 13-25) and the second stage validation checks the data form again to make sure the information provided meets the criteria of the specific destination before the information is supplied to the destination database. This hierarchy is necessary in the system of Hitchcock so that information can be customized for different institutions (column 7 lines 2-13). Sitaraman and Hitchcock are analogous arts because both are directed to data validation of web forms. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a "hierarchically organized" views in Sitaraman's system of validating user records so that the data could be customized for different destinations of the user records and that that customized data is validated before being stored at a destination.

Furthermore, Sitaraman and Hitchcock do not explicitly teach "changing the data to be validated to ASCII character strings, the validation rules also changing a validation function from an IsBetween method to an IsMember method." The CPA contains data validation functions, and functions which convert data into different strings (Sitaraman:

column 10 lines 26-32), and furthermore, compares validation rules to the data (Sitaraman: column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator of Sitaraman checks different attributes and attribute names. It would have been obvious to convert these attributes to ASCII strings for comparing, since it was well-known in the art that ASCII codes represent text in computers.

Claim 24 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A method according to claim 23, further comprising changing the validation function from a check between two integer values to a check for membership of a set (column 7 lines 28-40), *wherein the attributes are checked for membership in a set by comparing them to dictionary name location values* and if a value has no validation rules and where if a view has no validation rules, then performing a lower priority's view execution sequence (column 4 line 60 – column 5 line 3, column 7 lines 29-63), wherein the data validator validates the attribute name location first, then the attribute value location, and then checks if a value exists in each attribute definition location).

Claim 25 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A method according to claim 23, wherein the validation rules type cast a single value integer (column 7 lines 41-51), wherein the data validator checks that a value type is consistent with the value type stored in the dictionary name location.

Claim 26 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A method according to claim 23, further comprising type casting an integer as a string (column 7 lines 41-51), wherein the data validator checks that a value type is consistent with the value type stored in the dictionary name location by verifying the string or integer value.

Claim 27 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A method according to claim 23, further comprising changing legacy data to the ASCII character string values (column 10 lines 27-31), wherein the target data adapter converts the format of the validated user record into a suitable format and it would have been obvious to convert these attributes to ASCII strings for comparing, since it was well-known in the art that ASCII codes represent text in computers.

Claim 28 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 27. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A method according to claim 27, further comprising changing the legacy data to check for membership in a data set of ASCII character strings (column 10 lines 26-27), wherein the data is changed to a proper format, and uses an event, which matches an event type on the target interface.

Claim 29 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 27. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A method according to claim 27, further comprising tagging each validation rule with an associated application tag that differentiates versions of an application (column 2 lines 48-61), wherein there are different types of database definitions.

Claim 30 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 27. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A method according to claim 27, further comprising tagging each validation rule with an associated application tag that differentiates instances of an application and version for different users.

Claim 9 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 1. Sitaraman does not explicitly disclose that the validation rules validate weekday, date available, and date of expiration for long distance telephone service. However, Sitaraman discloses validating data, wherein the user data can include "user's name, address, telephone number, account type, and the like" (column 2 lines 61-67), wherein the information is used for specific subscribers, the subscribers being one of a telephone company or ISP (column 1 lines 13-18). It was well-known in the art at the time of invention, that the telephone

company's account information includes dates and dates of expiration for long distance telephone service, as telephone service is cutoff at a certain date if the bill is not paid. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include weekday, data available, and date of expiration in the account information that is being validated.

6. Claims 8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,332) in view of Hitchcock et al. (U.S. Patent 6,460,042) in further in view of Allen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,918).

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 7. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A client-server computer system according to claim 7. Sitaraman does not explicitly disclose that the validation rules return individual validation statuses in a hash table. Allen teaches data is indexed and arranged in a form of a hash table (Figure 5C item 520, column 10 lines 60-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the system of Sitaraman with Allen to index data in the form of a hash table to perform quick lookups and searches as delineated by Allen (column 10 lines 65-66) and to perform remote administration capability so the administrator can manage multiple systems located at different locations to save on support costs.

Claim 19 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 18. Furthermore, Sitaraman discloses:

A web server computer system according to claim 18. Sitaraman does not explicitly disclose that the validation rules return individual validation statuses in a hash table. Allen teaches data is indexed and arranged in a form of a hash table (Figure 5C item 520, column 10 lines 60-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the system of Sitaraman with Allen to index data in the form of a hash table to perform quick lookups and searches as delineated by Allen (column 10 lines 65-66) and to perform remote administration capability so the administrator can manage multiple systems located at different locations to save on support costs.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 571-272-3786. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KA
3/28/2007

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER